1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WALTER LEE YOUNG, Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al., Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-03914-PCP

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE

On April 28, 2025, the Court dismissed the original complaint because it failed to state a cognizable claim for relief. Dkt. No. 16. The Court granted partial leave to amend. See id. The amended complaint was due June 6, 2025, see id., but has not been filed, see generally, Dkt.

Because Plaintiff failed to amend despite opportunity and a warning of the consequences, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. See Harris v. Mangum, 863 F.3d 1133, 1141-42 (9th Cir. 2017) (recognizing propriety of dismissing action where plaintiff failed to amend).

If Plaintiff believes he can state a cognizable claim, he may move to reopen this action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59, 60. To do this, he must file an amended complaint in accordance with the Court's previous order and a motion with the words MOTION TO REOPEN written on the first page.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 22, 2025 25

United States District Judge

y Rom